



## Interview Summary

Application No. 09/369,883 Applicant(s)

Crouzet et al.

Examiner

WILLIAM SANDALS

Group Art Unit 1636

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):	
(1) WILLIAM SANDALS (3)	
(2) Steve O'Connor, Esq. (4)	
Date of Interview Mar 16, 2000	
Type: 🛮 Telephonic 🗆 Personal (copy is given to 🗀 applicant 🗀 applicant's representati	ive).
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:   Yes  No. If yes, brief description:	
Agreement  was reached.  was not reached.	
Claim(s) discussed: <u>1-20, 22-25, and 27-51</u>	
Identification of prior art discussed:  None	
We discussed the restriction requirement and Mr. O'Connor requested a written restriction.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner at the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendents which would render is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)	agreed would render
1. X It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview	ew.
Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESLAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVE FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.	V. (See MPEP
Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a compeach of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office actaims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirement Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview units also checked.	tion, and since the ents of the last
Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.	